

When Brisbane Answered Harvey

that the high duty on wool will fall directly upon the consumer. It will be the man who buys a suit of clothes who will suffer. The suit that has been sold for \$10 heretofore will necessarily cost \$12, and possibly \$12.50, if the Aldrich bill passes and is signed by the president. The \$10 suit will be an impossibility, unless it is built of shoddy or cotton mixtures.

"The increase in duty will benefit about 22,000 persons engaged in sheep raising in the United States, counting the dealers and handlers of wool. The victims will be the other 80,000,000 persons in the population of the United States. In saying 22,000 persons benefited we are counting 20,000 employees. Really, the persons whose pockets will be gorged by the raise in duty are not 22,000 in number, but possibly only 100 rich men, who buy the wool of the United States and handle it under a gentlemen's agreement made each year in Boston.

"The blow of the increased duty falls hardest on the poor man. The increase will be mainly on the lower priced suits. Such suits are made of American woolsens fabricated from American wools. The gentlemen's agreement fixes the price of this wool at just a few cents under the price of the cheapest imported wool. For this reason the jump in tariff will be felt most in the \$7.50 to \$12 suits."

FULL DINNER PAIL ITEM

The Detroit Journal prints this full dinner pail letter:

Editor The Journal. The article from the city sealer a few nights ago interested me greatly. The city sealer ought to know that nearly every grocer and peddler in the city gives short measure. I do not mean that every dealer gives short measures in everything all the time, but there is always some one thing he measures short. Is there a housewife in Detroit who ever got a full bushel of potatoes? If your grocer is honest, he will tell you he doesn't get but three and one-half pecks himself for a bushel, and you can bet he won't give more than he gets.

Berries are always short measure, compared with the measures the farmers must give. Then as for these cans of molasses, which the sealer spoke of. They are not sold as cans but as quarts. Ask any dealer for a quart of molasses and he will ask you what price. If you say "ten cents," you will get three cups; if you say "15 cents" you will get a full quart. If the city sealer doesn't believe this, let him try it.

Any housekeeper who wouldn't go into court and testify against a cheating grocer or peddler deserves to be cheated.

If women would take those matters up instead of gossiping over the back fence you would see more poor people getting ahead. Of course women couldn't vote or get any laws passed themselves, but they might stir their husbands up to do something.

If our husbands would spend more time trying to get lower prices on food and less crying for higher wages, it would pay them. Wages are high enough, if only we could make these Wall Street thieves, who control the price of necessities, put food down to where poor folks could get it.

Now I don't know very much, I am only a laborer's wife, so I want to ask some questions: Why do I have to pay 28 cents a dozen for eggs when the market price quoted in the Journal is 22½ cents?

Why didn't the price of milk go down the first of May?

Why did the price of ice rise 75 cents, up to where I have to go without it this summer? I am sure it was cold enough last winter to freeze all the ice we need.

Why could I get enough pork chops for my family last summer for 15 cents, and this summer have to pay 30 cents for the same amount?

The republicans had a lot to say about "the full dinner pail" a few years ago, but my husband's is getting emptier every year, though he has work and his wages are the same or rather \$1 a week more.

It is getting that the United States is as bad for poor folks as the old country.

Detroit, August 11. HOUSEKEEPER.

OF COURSE

John D. Rockefeller has declared himself against any income tax. This will strengthen the sentiment in favor of the tax for Rockefeller is one of the fellows whom the income tax is intended to reach. Under the present system he largely escapes taxation.

At a dinner given some time ago in honor of Lord Northcliffe, proprietor of the London Times, Mr. Arthur Brisbane responded to a toast. This versatile fashioner of the popular editorial had sat quietly for some time listening to a corporation lawyer who advised his hearers to "beware of the man who expresses sympathy for the poor," and to Colonel George Harvey, who stated a few words of the evils of socialism and the blessings of wealth. When Mr. Brisbane was introduced he proceeded in his short, snappy sentences to give his hearers as straight a talk as they ever listened to in their lives. He evidently felt it his duty at the Northcliffe dinner to tell his self-satisfied and successful audience that the great common people, of which he is the self-appointed spokesman, really exists. Mr. Brisbane said in part:

"This is a fine gathering of powerful men, big fortunes, and great reputations. I want to say something for the men that never had a million dollars, never got on the payroll of a millionaire.

"I don't want Northcliffe to go back to England believing that a man without a million in this country might as well hide under the table or jump off the dock.

"The real American nation, its real resources, its real ability, are hidden among those unknown seventy-nine millions that never go to Delmonico's, most of whom know as little about terrapin as about bird's nest soup.

"Mr. Harvey says very truly, 'The great reward must go to the man of great ability.' True. But what is the great reward, and what do you call great ability?

"If I scatter money in the street and a thousand eager men dive to get it, I am holding up one kind of a reward, and I call forth one kind of ability.

"But if a child is in danger of its life, and a man risks his life to save it, that situation calls out a different kind of ability, and reveals a man who asks for a higher reward than cash.

"We are paying too much attention here to the men that scramble for pennies, for dollars and for millions. They are able, strong men, but they are not the American nation, nor the best men in it.

LEGAL HONESTY

John D. Rockefeller is quoted in one of the Sunday papers as having said:

"When a man has accumulated a sum of money within the law, that is to say in a legally honest way, the people no longer have any right to share in the earnings resulting from that accumulation."

It is a striking characteristic of a man of strict personal morality that he has never been able to see the difference between legal honesty and moral honesty. It is also to Mr. Rockefeller's credit that he defines the methods whereby the Standard Oil combination and all which it implies were created as being "legally honest." They were certainly morally indefensible. Here is the remarkable case of a man who is a good husband and father, benevolent along large lines, personally humane, pious rather than religious, in many ways a most desirable citizen; who yet can not see that there is anything morally wrong in an action which the law does not punish. It would be impossible, moreover, to make Mr. Rockefeller see the difference, and that not from any forwardness or prejudice on his part, but from a kind of moral myopia which blinds him to facts most of us find self-evident.

It is probable that the law does not directly influence, sanction or control more than five per cent of the actions of a man's life. They are apart from the law and beyond its reach. The law can not make a man moral or even honest, and he may break the rules of morality and honesty in many ways without coming within reach of a statute.

But Mr. Rockefeller says that the people have no right to share in the earnings of "legally honest" accumulations. It will astonish that worthy gentleman to hear it, but this is flat-footed anarchy. The accumulation was made with the sanction and under the protection of the people. It could not have been even "legally honest" save that society made it legally possible. So far from owing nothing to the people, Mr. Rockefeller owes everything, after a fair deduction for his very fine brains and adminis-

trative ability. This is not socialism. It is the practical working law of good morals in the relation of society to the individual and the reciprocal obligation of the individual to society.

It is curious that the richer a man gets the more he hates paying taxes. Mr. Rockefeller does not want to pay an income tax. No doubt he would not be the richest man in America now if he had not made it his rule through life to pay out as little of that kind of money as possible. This is all his argument really amounts to, but we are indebted to it for a curious piece of self-revelation. It slows us a sincere desire to do well, accompanied by a moral conception hardly more than embryonic.—Wall Street Journal.

trative ability. This is not socialism. It is the practical working law of good morals in the relation of society to the individual and the reciprocal obligation of the individual to society.

It is curious that the richer a man gets the more he hates paying taxes. Mr. Rockefeller does not want to pay an income tax. No doubt he would not be the richest man in America now if he had not made it his rule through life to pay out as little of that kind of money as possible. This is all his argument really amounts to, but we are indebted to it for a curious piece of self-revelation. It slows us a sincere desire to do well, accompanied by a moral conception hardly more than embryonic.—Wall Street Journal.

trative ability. This is not socialism. It is the practical working law of good morals in the relation of society to the individual and the reciprocal obligation of the individual to society.

It is curious that the richer a man gets the more he hates paying taxes. Mr. Rockefeller does not want to pay an income tax. No doubt he would not be the richest man in America now if he had not made it his rule through life to pay out as little of that kind of money as possible. This is all his argument really amounts to, but we are indebted to it for a curious piece of self-revelation. It slows us a sincere desire to do well, accompanied by a moral conception hardly more than embryonic.—Wall Street Journal.

trative ability. This is not socialism. It is the practical working law of good morals in the relation of society to the individual and the reciprocal obligation of the individual to society.

It is curious that the richer a man gets the more he hates paying taxes. Mr. Rockefeller does not want to pay an income tax. No doubt he would not be the richest man in America now if he had not made it his rule through life to pay out as little of that kind of money as possible. This is all his argument really amounts to, but we are indebted to it for a curious piece of self-revelation. It slows us a sincere desire to do well, accompanied by a moral conception hardly more than embryonic.—Wall Street Journal.

GOOD ADVICE TO MR. TAFT

In a letter written to President Taft, H. J. Hammil, a director of the carded woolen manufacturers association says:

"I ask that when the Payne tariff bill is received you do your duty as fearlessly, unflinchingly and as thoroughly as your public utterances and acts during the campaign led those who voted for you to believe you would do it.

"That would mean a veto of the Payne bill because of the burdens it imposes on the people and because of its violation of the pledges made by you and your party before the election.

"It would also mean that while you are president no measure passed by congress in obedience to a mandate from the people would receive executive approval while the contributions to the majority's congressional campaign fund remained unpublished."

SUSPICIOUS

The Washington correspondent for the Philadelphia North American wires his paper that people are beginning to be suspicious that Senator Aldrich is not a foe to the trust system.

How in the world could any one suspect Nelson A. Aldrich of anything but an abiding concern for the public welfare?